

Copy

BriGen E. A. Montgomery, USMC  
Asst Chief of Staff for Operations  
Staff Commander in Chief Pacific  
Box 13, c/o FPO San Francisco, Calif.

19 December 1958

BriGen M. C. Young, USAF  
Subsidiary Activities Division  
J5 Division, JCS  
Washington 25, D.C.

THIS DOCUMENT CONTAINS INFORMATION  
THAT THE CIA HAS DETERMINED MUST BE  
CLASSIFIED AT THE LEVEL INDICATED:

TS S (C)

AUTHORITY: HR 70-2

Dear General Young,

REVIEWED: 025614 DATE: 6 Feb 1986

25X1

The three PACOM representatives who attended Project [ ] (Captain John Frye Morse, USN, Chief Plans and Policy Branch, Communications Division CINCPAC; LtCol Eugene Smith, USA, Executive and Special Project Officer, Plans Division, G-3, Hq U.S. Army Pacific, and LtCol Opdall, USAF, Assistant Director of Collection, A C/S Intelligence, Hq Pacific Air Forces) have submitted reports thereon to my Special Warfare Branch and indicated that you requested informal comments which could be used for record purposes in connection with military participation in future courses.

The reports of aforementioned officers are summarized as follows:

- a. The eighty-hour course was evaluated as excellent and provided key staff officers of all commands beneficial instruction and information on the organization, operation, intelligence, and plans of the agency. The calibre of some fifty speakers, which included Mr. Dulles, Gen Cabell, Mr. Amory, and the other experts across the board, was considered outstanding. It would be nearly impossible to assemble such a group of high level speakers at any conference outside the Washington area.
- b. Military-CIA command relationships should be covered in more detail.
- c. Communications matters should be allotted more time especially with regard to base stations.
- d. Presentations should be reviewed overall to ensure that the desired balance is expressed between CIA capabilities and CIA limitations. CIA limitations appeared to be overemphasized during the course in comparison with capabilities.
- e. More senior officers (Colonels and above) should be encouraged to attend.
- f. The course should continue to be presented annually and attendees suggested quotas as follows: CINCPAC Staff, 5; USARPAC, 2; PACAF, 3; and FMFPAC, 1.

JOBN NO. BOX NO. FILE NO. DOC NO. NO CHANGE  
IN CLASS. DECLASS. CLASS. CHANGED TO: TS S C DET. HSK  
NEXT REV. DATE: 1986-01-01  
NO. PGE. CREATION DATE: 040-1000-071 ORG CLASS  
REV CLASS: REV COORD. AUTH: HA 70-3

In addition to the above comments, I thought that you personally might be interested in some of the difficulties encountered in filling the CINCPAC quota. I might preface this by stating that funds, availability of the proper personnel for approximately 3 weeks, and the objectives and scope of the course as stated in pertinent correspondence had to be weighed one against the other at various levels. Flag and General officers and other Chiefs were subjected to the "hard sell" by various individuals before they went along with nominating personnel to fill quotas. Some of the questions that arose and comments follow:

2. a. Based on the objectives and scope of the course, as stated in the JCS paper, what are our people going to get in Washington that local CIA personnel couldn't present as well or better from a PACOM point of view? Comment. - The objective and scope of the project should be more fully explained to clearly indicate the benefits to be derived therefrom by military participants.

b. Considering an officer's retainability in a specific job and his probable utilization of information obtained, why isn't the course presented at a time which will permit attendance by officers scheduled for PACOM assignments, and who will benefit most from the familiarization outlined? Comment. - The best time would be late spring, or early summer.

c. Why the apparent selection of UW and PW personnel over intelligence personnel for attendance at this course? Comment. - Suggest consideration be given to the usefulness of presenting this course within the framework of "CIA a Wartime Component." This should stimulate practical interest of senior military personnel other than those involved in so-called specialized fields.

d. Why can't more time be given to select the right man for the project? Comment. - A command as spread out as the PACOM should have a minimum of 60 days to process attendance quotas among the component and subordinate unified commands. Time must be provided to permit internal PACOM allocation, acceptance, rejection, and reallocation of CINCPAC quota.

e. CIA VIPs (two star equivalent and higher), even as an aside, should assist in "selling" this project during their routine visits to senior military commanders. This would be less awkward than leaving it entirely up to military personnel directly concerned and to local CIA personnel.

f. With ample time for processing quotas I believe that the PACOM might be able to fully utilize, among all subordinate commands, a quota of 8 of 12. A strong effort should be made to have at least half of the quota filled by personnel who are expecting PACOM assignments in fields where they will be better qualified by having had a knowledge of CIA's mission, organization, capabilities and limitations.

The most cordial relationships exist between local CIA personnel and our own staff. I am interested in doing anything that will maintain and enhance the military-CIA teamwork required now and in wartime. To this end I hope the above comments may be of some use to you.

Sincerely yours,

E. A. MONTGOMERY  
Brigadier General, U. S. Marine Corps